

REMARKS

The above-referenced patent application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action referenced above. Reconsideration of the above-referenced patent application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 8, and 14 are amended. No claims have been cancelled or added.

The Examiner has objected to FIG. 1 for a minor and inadvertent typographical error. A replacement sheet is provided with this response. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his objection.

The Examiner has objected to the specification for a few minor and inadvertent typographical errors. The specification has been amended to address the Examiner's concerns. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his objection.

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract. It has been amended to address the Examiner's concerns. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his objection.

It is noted that these issues are directed to minor informalities in the application and do not at all relate to substantive issues regarding to the patent application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 3 under 35 USC 102(e) on US Patent No. 6,694,062 (hereinafter "Yang"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is noted that to establish a prima facie case of anticipation the Examiner must provide a document that discloses each and every limitation of the rejected claim or claims. It is asserted that Yang does not meet this requirement.

Applicants begin with claim 1. It is noted that claim 1, as amended, recites a changeable calibration chart. Applicant asserts that the claim as amended patentably distinguishes claim 1 from the cited document. Yang does not disclose or suggest this particular element. Support is provided throughout the specification, such as, for example, at the bottom of page 5. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his rejection as to claim 1, as amended.


Applicant at this time takes no specific position regarding the Examiner's statements in the office action with respect to what Yang may illustrate. Therefore, Applicant reserves the right to disagree with any of those positions or statements. However, Applicant believes the amendment of claim 1 renders those issues moot.

It is noted that claim 3 depends from claim 1. Therefore, this claim distinguishes from the cited document at least on the same basis as claim 1, as amended. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw his rejection as to claim 3.

The Examiner has rejected the remaining claims on 35 USC 103 based upon various combinations of Yang with other cited documents. These rejections are traversed.

As indicated above, claim 1, as amended, recites a changeable calibration chart. Likewise, claims 8 and 14 as so amended as well. Yang fails to provide this missing element and the remaining cited documents do not appear to cure this deficiency. Therefore, the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case under 35 USC 103.

Applicant takes no specific position in this response regarding the appropriateness of the combinations asserted by the Examiner or regarding his statements in the above referenced office action explaining what he believes the cited documents may illustrate. Therefore, Applicant reserves the right to disagree with any of those positions or statements. Nonetheless, they are all rendered moot by the amendment of claims 1, 8 and 14.




CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully asserted that all of the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the undersigned at (503) 629-7477. Reconsideration of this patent application and early allowance of all of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 6-15-05


Gerald Haynes
Reg. No. 32,854

Send Correspondence to:
5250 NE Elam Young Parkway
Suite 850
Hillsboro, OR 97124
(503) 640.6475